

## REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 5-7 and 9-37 without prejudice. New Claims 38-45 are added. Claims 1-4, 8 and 38-45 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 8 are amended. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abel et al. ("Abel;" US 4,812,742). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited by Claims 1, 4 and 8 is not shown or suggested by Abel.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method comprising "receiving a die comprising an integrated circuit formed on a semiconductor substrate; forming a wire connection between a circuit contact pad in said integrated circuit and a lead contact pad in a package substrate bonded to said semiconductor substrate; and testing said wire connection for non-stick failure by checking for electrical continuity along a path comprising said circuit contact pad and a non-stick detection (NSD) contact pad coupled to said semiconductor substrate, wherein said semiconductor substrate itself provides electrical continuity between said circuit contact pad and said NSD contact pad for said testing" (emphasis added). In essence, Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention includes a semiconductor substrate between a circuit contact pad and an NSD contact pad, where the semiconductor substrate itself provides electrical continuity between those two pads, in particular during testing. Applicants respectfully submit that Abel does not show or suggest such a limitation.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not shown or suggested by Abel, and that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed. Claims 4 and 8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is also traversed, as Claims 4 and 8 are dependent on an allowable base claim.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abel in view of Brooks et al. ("Brooks;" US 6,326,244). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited by Claims 2 and 3 is not shown or suggested by Abel and Brooks, alone or in combination.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Abel does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that Brooks does not overcome the shortcomings of Abel. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Brooks, alone or in combination with Abel, does not show or suggest "receiving a die comprising an integrated circuit formed on a semiconductor substrate; forming a wire connection between a circuit contact pad in said integrated circuit and a lead contact pad in a package substrate bonded to said semiconductor substrate; and testing said wire connection for non-stick failure by checking for electrical

continuity along a path comprising said circuit contact pad and a non-stick detection (NSD) contact pad coupled to said semiconductor substrate, wherein said semiconductor substrate itself provides electrical continuity between said circuit contact pad and said NSD contact pad for said testing" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and recite additional limitations.

#### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-4 and 8, as well as new Claims 38-45, overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 2/25/04

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

William A. Zarbis  
William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060